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OPENING OF THE SESSION

The SECRETARY-GENERAL declared open the first session of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference.

The Committee, established by General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) which, as was known, had been adopted unanimously was starting to work on a very serious and important task. As had been decided by the Assembly, the Committee was to examine all the views and suggestions expressed by Governments on the convening of a world disarmament conference and related problems, including conditions for the realization of such a conference, and to submit, on the basis of consensus, a report to the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session.

Through the years, the United Nations had resorted to many different approaches and techniques in order to come to grips with the problem of disarmament. During the last decade, more than once the idea of a world disarmament conference had been debated by the General Assembly. Since 1971, when the Assembly for the first time had affirmed, in another unanimous resolution, the desirability of giving careful attention to the convening, following adequate preparation, of a world disarmament conference, many views had been expressed by Governments on the question. Those views had been recorded in the official documents of the Organization.

He was sure that the Ad Hoc Committee would examine all views expressed in the most careful and objective manner. He also had no doubt that the Committee would make every possible effort to achieve consensus in its deliberations, thus complying with the General Assembly's request as contained in resolution 3183 (XXVIII), and contributing effectively to progress towards the goal of a world disarmament conference.

He would follow with interest the progress of the Committee's work. Meanwhile, he extended to all members of the Committee his best wishes for the successful accomplishment of its important task.
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The SECRETARY-GENERAL pointed out that the agenda for the first meeting had been circulated in document A/AC.167/L.1. If he heard no objections, he would assume that the agenda was adopted.

It was so decided.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. SEN (India) nominated Mr. Hoveyda (Iran) for the post of Chairman.

Mr. SAITO (Japan) supported the nomination.

Mr. Hoveyda (Iran) was elected Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the Committee for the confidence it had placed in him. He was certain to be speaking on its behalf in thanking the Secretary-General for having honoured the Committee's first meeting with his presence and for having opened the session by making a statement. He also thanked the representatives of India and Japan for the kind words they had addressed to him and the group of non-aligned countries, and particularly the representative of Mexico, who had supported him.

The members of the Committee were well aware of the difficult problems they would have to face. Although, during the preceding year and at the last session of the General Assembly some progress had been made, it had been mainly procedural and the substantive problems remained. He nevertheless expressed the hope that, with the co-operation of all, the Committee would be able to conclude its task successfully.

Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia) congratulated the Chairman on his election and nominated Mr. Kulaga for the post of Vice-Chairman.

Mr. ZULETA (Colombia), after having congratulated the Chairmán, nominated Mr. Perez de Cuellar (Peru) for the post of second Vice-Chairman.

Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) associated himself with the congratulations that had been addressed to the Chairman. He supported the nomination of Mr. Kulaga and Mr. Perez de Cuellar and also nominated Mr. Mikanagu (Burundi).

Mr. Kulaga, Mr. Perez de Cuellar and Mr. Mikanagu were elected Vice-Chairmen.

/...
Mr. LONGERSTAEY (Belgium) congratulated the Chairman and Vice-Chairmen on their election and nominated Mr. Elias (Spain) for the post of Rapporteur. Mr. Elias (Spain) was elected Rapporteur.

Mr. KULAGA (Poland) congratulated the Chairman on his election. He thanked Ambassador Mojssov for having nominated him and the members of the Committee for having elected him Vice-Chairman. They could be assured that he would take an active part in the important work of the Committee.

Mr. PEREZ DE CUELLAR (Peru) congratulated the Chairman and the officers on their election. He thanked the members of the Committee for having elected him Vice-Chairman and in particular the representative of Colombia who had nominated him. He would play all the more active a role in the work of the Committee because he came from a country and a region where peace was considered as a fundamental objective and disarmament as the best way of achieving it.

Mr. MIKANAGU (Burundi) congratulated the officers on their election. He assured the Committee that he would do everything in his power to deserve the confidence they had placed in him and thanked the representative of Algeria for having nominated him.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain), after having congratulated the Chairman and the Vice-Chairmen, thanked the members of the Committee in whose work he would participate enthusiastically.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee’s mandate was apparently simple. It was defined in General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII), and in particular in paragraph one, which stated that the Committee was "to examine all the views and suggestions expressed by Governments on the convening of a world disarmament conference and related problems, ... and to submit, on the basis of consensus, a report to the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session". In paragraph three of the resolution, the General Assembly "Invites the States possessing nuclear weapons to co-operate or maintain contact with the Ad Hoc Committee", and he was glad to note that the representatives of several such States were attending the first meeting.

The Committee had before it document A/AC.167/L.2 containing the replies
(The Chairman)

received by the Secretary-General in pursuance of paragraph four of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) and also had before it a letter addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Representative of the USSR (A/9590).

The Committee should now decide on the path it should follow in order to discharge the mandate conferred upon it. It might wish to entrust the officers with the task of studying the organization of work unless it preferred that the question should be discussed by all the members of the Committee.

Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) proposed that, in conformity with normal practice, the officers should hold consultations and then present in writing an outline of the organization of work.

Mr. SENG (India) supported the proposal. There was no reason why the officers, who represented countries with both a geographical and a political balance, should not meet privately and work out proposals to be submitted later to the Committee, either in writing or orally.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) supported the Brazilian proposal but wished to make a slight amendment to it. The Committee could devote the meeting or meetings of the following day to a discussion during which representatives wishing to do so would submit specific proposals on the organization of work. It would in no way be a general debate but the Committee would be holding working meetings and what might be called "collective consultations" preceding the meeting of the officers, whose task would thereby be greatly facilitated.

Mr. MIGLIUOLO (Italy) supported the Brazilian proposal whose adoption would expedite the Committee's work. The working document to be prepared by the officers should deal not only with the organization of work but also with the way in which the Committee planned to implement paragraph three of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) and "to co-operate or maintain contact" with the States possessing nuclear weapons.

The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would assume that the Committee decided to adopt the Brazilian proposal, taking into account the comments made by the representatives of Mexico and Italy.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.20 p.m.

/...
2nd meeting

Wednesday, 8 May 1974,
at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Hoveyda (Iran)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK (continued)

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the officers had met the day before to discuss the organization of work and had agreed with the views expressed at the first meeting to the effect that there was no need for a general debate. However, all delegations would be free to make statements under paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII). With regard to paragraph 3 of the resolution, which invited the States possessing nuclear weapons to co-operate or maintain contact with the Committee, the officers had noted with pleasure that representatives of three of the five nuclear Powers had been present. They had felt that the Chairman should in due course contact the permanent representatives of the other two Powers - which were no doubt keeping informed of the Committee's work and could, if necessary, react to the statements made in the Committee - to ask them what they planned to do in the light of that paragraph.

Mr. Driss (Tunisia) asked how many meetings the Ad Hoc Committee would have before the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN replied that two meetings were scheduled for that day and for the next two days and that another one-week session was planned for 24-28 June. The Committee would probably meet twice daily then as well. There was also a possibility of another session at the beginning of September, although the exact dates had not yet been set.

Mr. Garcia Robles (Mexico) thought it would be useful to recall the background of the proposed World Disarmament Conference and to point out some conclusions that could be drawn. The initiative in proposing a world disarmament conference had been taken at the Conference of Heads of State of Government of Non-Aligned Countries in 1961 and 1964 and in General Assembly resolution 2030 (XX), which had been based on a draft resolution sponsored by 42 of the non-aligned countries. The first lesson to be drawn from the unfortunate experience of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 2930 (XXVII) - the
(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

appointment of whose members had taken an entire year - was that in so delicate and complex a matter it was better to make haste slowly and that the nuclear Powers must avoid any action that might give the impression, rightly or wrongly, that they were trying to obtain a privileged position in the Committee.

It was therefore clear that, in order to enhance its chances of success, the Committee should at the present stage adhere to the mandate assigned to it by the Assembly, namely, examine all the views and suggestions expressed by Governments on the convening of a world disarmament conference and related problems, including conditions for the realization of such a conference. To facilitate its task, the Secretary-General might be requested to prepare, as quickly as possible, a summary of the views and suggestions put forward since the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, whether in the First Committee, in plenary or in communications to the Secretary-General, classified by subject and country and accompanied by an index. The summary should be distributed sufficiently in advance of the Committee's second session to enable delegations to study it at leisure. It would also be useful if, in the meantime, members who maintained contact with the nuclear Powers explored informally the possibility of reaching agreements on the solution of some, at least, of the disarmament problems most frequently mentioned in debates. That would hasten the day when it would be possible to convene a World Disarmament Conference in which all nuclear Powers would actively participate and which would be open to all.

Mr. BJÖRFORSTEDT (Secretary of the Committee), replying to a question from the Chairman, said that the views and suggestions of Member States put forward at the last three sessions of the General Assembly accounted for some 800 pages of documentation and that the time needed to prepare a summary would depend on the degree of condensation desired. Assuming that the Committee would want a document of about 20 to 30 pages, a certain amount of judgement would have to be exercised in compiling the summary from oral statements and written replies. The Committee might therefore like the Secretariat to prepare a draft which members could comment on and which could then be finalized. If that procedure was followed, the initial draft might be ready at the beginning of June and finalized by mid-June, giving members adequate time before the second session started on 24 June.
Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that that procedure would be acceptable. However, he asked whether the Secretary was suggesting that the summary should be no more than 20 pages, which would mean condensing the material rather drastically.

The CHAIRMAN assured the Mexican representative that the final summary would be a fairly substantial document.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) recalled that although the idea of convening a World Disarmament Conference was not new - having first been proposed by the non-aligned countries in 1961 - the fact that all States Members of the United Nations, including the five nuclear Powers, had voted for General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII), under which preliminary studies had been started with a view to the convening of such a conference, was a new and encouraging development. The Committee's main concern should therefore be to establish a fruitful dialogue which would make it possible to move towards the Conference without upsetting the fragile consensus that had been achieved.

His delegation had repeatedly stated that, if disarmament negotiations were to produce an effective text, it was essential that all the nuclear Powers and all the militarily significant nations should participate; that was more important than the forum in which the negotiations were held. The failure of France and the People's Republic of China to attend the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament had led his delegation to give its firm support in 1972 to the Soviet proposal for a World Disarmament Conference. Such a conference could be an appropriate means of bringing together the five members of the so-called nuclear club in a joint disarmament effort. His delegation had felt that, once the participation of those Powers was assured, it would be possible for all States to work together to establish priorities for disarmament, starting with nuclear disarmament, and set up procedural machinery for co-ordinating the work of the various negotiating bodies. His delegation had nevertheless laid down two prerequisites for the convening of such a conference, namely, that careful and adequate preparations should be made and that all States, whether they were Members of the United Nations or not, should be free to participate. Although the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 2930 (XXVII) in accordance with a proposal put
forward by his delegation had never officially met, a similar decision, resolution 3183 (XXVIII), had been unanimously adopted at the next session of the General Assembly and the time had now come to implement its provisions. His delegation had two suggestions on how the Ad Hoc Committee should carry out its task.

In view of the limited time available to the Committee and its obligation to carry out a serious in-depth study, it might perhaps be possible to establish a working group to prepare a draft or at least suggest the bases for a discussion which would assist the Committee in its preparation of the report to be submitted to the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly. The membership of such a working group would obviously be based on equitable geographical distribution, and its duration would be limited to about one month.

The representative of Mexico had already made the other suggestion which he wished to make, namely that, in order to facilitate the task of such a working group, the Secretariat should be requested to prepare a document summarizing the replies of Governments to the Secretary-General and the views expressed by delegations during discussions in the First Committee, the plenary Assembly and the Ad Hoc Committee. In view of the information provided by the Secretary and the considerable volume of documentation involved, the Committee might decide to request both the full documentation and a separate summary of the opinions expressed by delegations. The Secretary had indicated that it would take about a month to prepare the condensed document. If a working group was established, it could meet when the documentation was ready and ensure that the summary reflected accurately the views expressed by delegations on previous occasions. On the basis of the summary and the full documentation, the working group could prepare a draft for submission to the Committee.

Lastly, if such a solution was adopted, the working group could be entrusted with maintaining the contacts referred to in paragraph 3 of General Assembly
resolution 3183 (XXVIII). Those were the ideas he wished to submit to the Committee for consideration with a view to finding the most effective approach to its work.

Mr. MOJCSI (Yugoslavia) said that there was no need at the present stage for him to repeat his Government's position on all the important questions concerning the World Disarmament Conference. His delegation's views were contained in document A/8617 and could be found in the records of the First Committee and the plenary meetings of the twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth sessions of the General Assembly. The adoption, by consensus, of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) and the speedy constitution of the Ad Hoc Committee at its first meeting marked a significant advance which should be maintained.

He recalled the sixth preambular paragraph of resolution 3183 (XXVIII) and reminded members that a growing number of countries shared the view that the early convening of an adequately prepared World Disarmament Conference, with the participation of all States, was important and desirable. It was in that context that the Ad Hoc Committee should fulfil its mandate, endeavouring to create the conditions needed for the convening of the World Disarmament Conference and to remove any difficulties or obstacles which might exist. The task before the Committee was complex, and the mistakes made in the past should be avoided.

General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) entrusted the Committee with a twofold task. The first part of that task was set out in paragraph 1. In his delegation's view, the Committee, in examining all the views and suggestions expressed by Governments, should draw conclusions from all appropriate sources, such as replies to the Secretary-General and statements by delegations in the First Committee and the plenary. Important views on the matter had also been expressed at international conferences such as the Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in Algiers, whose final act had been circulated as a United Nations document. His delegation therefore supported the Mexican proposal that the Committee should be provided with all necessary studies and tabulations, by country and subject, based on the relevant material, since they would give a clear picture of the attitude of most countries towards the World Disarmament Conference and of any changes in their
(Mr. Mojsov, Yugoslavia)

attitude. The Committee's report should contain an evaluation of the views and suggestions of Governments and the trends shown therein, with the conclusions and recommendations the Committee considered helpful and realistic.

The second task of the Committee was set out in paragraph 3 of the resolution. Although in that paragraph the nuclear States were invited to co-operate or maintain contact with the Committee, it was logical that the Committee or its Bureau should also co-operate and maintain contact with the nuclear Powers. The Committee should entrust the Chairman, the Bureau, its members or a group of members with that task, and they might then explore ideas concerning the conditions which should exist for further progress and the ultimate convening of the Conference. It was clear from the tenth preambular paragraph of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) that the Ad Hoc Committee was not intended to be a preparatory committee for the World Disarmament Conference. However, members were well aware of the growing dissatisfaction among members of the international community with the current situation concerning disarmament negotiations. Efforts must be made to move more decisively if tangible results were to be obtained in the near future. The work of the Committee should reassure everyone that a World Disarmament Conference would serve the true interests of the international community as a whole. The Committee must therefore ensure that the views of all were taken into account. All the necessary conditions for the convening of the World Disarmament Conference must be created, but preconditions should not be allowed to impede the Committee's work towards that goal.

Mr. MIGLIUOLO (Italy) said that his Government's views on the World Disarmament Conference already appeared in United Nations documents and had not changed. He believed that a condensed document, such as that referred to by the Secretary, would undoubtedly help the Committee in its work. The Secretariat might have gleaned sufficient information from the unofficial consultations which had taken place in 1973 to have an idea about the preparation of a working document for the Ad Hoc Committee. It was important to consider the structure of such a document, which must be readily usable by members of the Committee in the
preparation of its report. The Committee would not be holding many meetings in June, but those scheduled could possibly be sufficient if a basic working document was prepared in advance. He felt that it might be possible to leave the preparation of such a document to the Secretariat. During the current session, members of the Committee could inform the Secretary of their ideas on the structure of the document, and he was confident that the Secretary would accomplish the task satisfactorily. His delegation supported some of the views expressed during the current meeting. If the document was not to be a mere chronological summary of the views and proposals of Member States, it would be helpful to the Committee to have a condensed version which pointed up the issues that deserved special attention in the Committee's report to the General Assembly. He had no specific suggestions to make regarding those issues and consequently the structure of the document but felt that the headings might include such items as the aim of the Conference, the conditions to be met for its convening, the structure of the preparatory committee and the proposed date and venue of the Conference. Obviously a well-prepared document would help the Committee in accomplishing its task.

He was grateful for the attention given to the suggestion he had made regarding the implementation of paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 3163 (XXVIII). The Committee should not limit itself to ensuring that the two nuclear Powers not represented on the Committee would be informed of its discussions. It was important that the Committee should establish and maintain such contacts in a constructive spirit at all stages of its work, and in his view it was for the Chairman to undertake them.

Mr. DISS (Tunisia) said that the document proposed by the representative of Mexico would surely help the Committee in its work. He felt that the Argentine proposal regarding the establishment of a working group should be borne in mind, but it might perhaps be more appropriate to postpone the establishment of such a group until the working document was made available. There was no doubt that the majority of States felt that a World Disarmament Conference should be held. All were agreed that the nuclear Powers should participate actively in such a conference. Unfortunately, some of those Powers did not wish to, but, if any progress was to be made, their cooperation was needed. It was essential that the Committee should be informed either verbally or in writing, of the current views of all the nuclear Powers on the convening of a World Disarmament Conference. What
(Mr. Driss, Tunisia)

was needed was a spirit of détente and understanding among all countries. General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) did not state that a World Disarmament Conference would be held, but the fact that it had been adopted by consensus implied that such a conference was desirable. It was to be hoped that the Ad Hoc Committee, which was composed of 40 non-nuclear-weapon Member States, could have a favourable influence on the situation.

Mr. OLCAY (Turkey) said that his country's views and suggestions on the convening of a World Disarmament Conference had been communicated to the Secretary-General, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2883 (XXVI), and had been reproduced in document A/8817.

The Committee's primary aim should be to ensure that firm foundations were laid for the success of the proposed conference if such a conference failed, it would only set back the progress already achieved.

The Committee should first determine the existing points of agreement and attempt to reconcile divergent views on disarmament and arms control. For that purpose, a systematic study of the views expressed and suggestions made by all States on various occasions over the last few years regarding the problems of disarmament and the machinery for effective international control could constitute a satisfactory basis for discussion. It would also be useful if the Committee could prepare a questionnaire on the same subject, which would serve to determine the current views and suggestions of States.

The Committee should seek a specific solution to the problem of the effective participation of all five nuclear Powers in the proposed conference; if any of them failed to take part, the results of the conference would be unsatisfactory.

The Committee could then make preparations for a World Disarmament Conference by determining the aims and working out the agenda of such a conference.

Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) recalled that the Committee had been set up in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII), which was adopted at a time when it had appeared almost impossible to convene a World Disarmament Conference because of opposition to the idea. The group of non-aligned countries had been very concerned about the difficulty of implementing the General Assembly's decision, which it regarded as the culmination of the efforts made in the field of
disarmament and felt that it was very important not to abandon the idea. The task of the Committee was therefore to make the Conference possible by overcoming the obstacles to convening it rather than to make practical arrangements.

The Committee's first task should be to draw up a list of the problems involved in convening a conference. The Secretariat should not prepare a summary of the views of each country, but should make an analysis of the problems revealed in the statements of the various countries, in particular the objections of the nuclear Powers to the convening of the conference.

Mr. Malik (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the principal topic of the recent special session of the General Assembly had been the acceleration of the development of the developing countries. It was quite obvious that the achievement of that epoch-making objective required the solution of the equally vital problem - since the two were closely interrelated - of the cessation of the arms race and the adoption of effective measures for disarmament. Millions of dollars that were essential for the development of the world as a whole and the developing countries in particular were being spent on arms. Development, détente and disarmament were closely interrelated. He trusted that all necessary efforts would be made to find practical ways of solving the problems of holding a World Disarmament Conference, despite the obstacles placed in its path by the opponents of peace, détente and disarmament. His delegation supported the Committee and would co-operate fully with it in the fulfilment of its tasks.

The General Assembly's decision, that an Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference should be established and the fact that it had commenced work, in the face of great obstacles, reflected the deep concern of the United Nations and of an overwhelming majority of the countries of the world with solving all aspects of the problem of disarmament. The preparation and convening of a World Disarmament Conference, which all States, large and small, would participate on a basis of equality, would represent a historical step in the long struggle of peace-loving peoples to halt the arms race and achieve disarmament.

The attempts made by the League of Nations to solve the problem of disarmament had failed. At that time the imperialist Powers had prevented a solution of the problem. Since the defeat of fascism, the role, influence and
significance in international life of the non-aligned and developing States and of the socialist countries had been steadily increasing. It was precisely those two important forces, which were most concerned with consolidating the peace and security of peoples and ensuring increasingly rapid economic development under conditions of peace and justice for present and future generations which were capable of curbing the forces of aggression and at the same time guiding the opponents of disarmament onto the correct path. Under those new historical conditions, the United Nations would be able to avoid the unfortunate fate of the League of Nations in its attempts to solve the problem of disarmament.

The idea of disarmament had been put forward by the Soviet Government as long ago as 1922, when it had submitted a broad programme of peaceful co-operation and disarmament at an international conference in Genoa. Since that time, the struggle against militarism and for disarmament had always been an inseparable part of the Soviet Union's activities at the international level; that had been confirmed in the peace programme approved in 1971 by the Twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Part of the Soviet Union. On the question of disarmament, the following fundamental goals had been proclaimed as the basis of Soviet policy: the conclusion of treaties banning nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons; the nuclear disarmament of all States possessing nuclear weapons, and the convening for that purpose of a conference of the five nuclear Powers - the USSR, the United States, the People's Republic of China, France and the United Kingdom; the intensification of the struggle to halt the race in all types of weapons, and the convening of a world conference to consider the whole range of disarmament questions. It had been stated that the Soviet Union was prepared to negotiate agreements on the reduction of military expenditure, particularly by the major Powers.

His delegation was firmly convinced that initiating favourable consideration of the important and topical question of the preparations for a World Disarmament Conference would reflect the interest of all peoples in bringing about a further normalization of the international atmosphere and the strengthening of peace and security. Convening the Conference would be an important step towards realizing the desire of many States for military as well as political détente in
international relations. The normalization of the international atmosphere which was taking place, and the further steps which were being taken to consolidate and perpetuate détente, constituted a firm foundation for the work of preparing and convening a World Disarmament Conference. Support for the idea of a conference was increasing in the world community, the International Federation of Resistance Movements had recently called on States Members of the United Nations to convene a conference as soon as possible. The clearly expressed opinion of the international community should find a response in the Committee's practical work of preparing for the convening of a conference. In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, conditions were favourable to the success of the Committee's task. Its membership had been increased in accordance with the wishes of a number of geographical groups of Member States.

In addition, a decision of the General Assembly had specified the procedure for participation by all the nuclear Powers in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) had also contained provisions on the co-operation of the nuclear Powers with the Ad Hoc Committee and their participation in the Committee's work with the same rights as other members. New and positive elements had appeared in the positions of the nuclear Powers; some of them had officially declared at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly and at the recent Special Session that they, too, supported "genuine disarmament". It was unfortunate that up to now not all the nuclear Powers had chosen to participate directly in the work of the Committee; such participation being an important contribution to the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference.

The socialist countries were encouraged by the agreement that existed between themselves and the developing countries on the need to convene a World Disarmament Conference. Mr. Boumediène, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council and Council of Ministers of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the non-aligned countries at the special session, had emphasized the need to achieve complete and general disarmament by convening a World Disarmament Conference. A solution to the problem of disarmament would undoubtedly contribute to the implementation of the decisions adopted by the
Assembly on the creation of a new international economic order. The halting of
the arms race and the achievement of disarmament should be an integral part of
that new order, and the unity and solidarity of the socialist and non-aligned
countries was a guarantee of the achievement of those aims. As had already
been repeatedly stated officially, the USSR was in favour of the preparation
and convening of the World Disarmament Conference and believed that
all the nuclear Powers should participate in it, just as they should actively
participate in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. While some of those Powers were
still not prepared to join the Committee, his delegation still hoped that they
would be able to do so at a later stage. In any case, they had stated officially
that they were prepared to co-operate with the Committee, and that gave rise to
hope that those words would be followed by practical deeds.

Thus the obstacles which had arisen in the past had been removed, and the
Ad Hoc Committee was at last able to embark on its normal official work.

In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, it was time to get down to practical
work, in order to take the first step in preparing for the convening of the World
Disarmament Conference. For its part, the Soviet delegation would do all it
could to promote the success of the Committee's work. It was ready and willing
to take a most active part in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World
Disarmament Conference.

Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) said that his delegation welcomed the suggestion
made by the representative of Algeria. If the Tunisian representative's suggestion
was further developed, the Committee would be made aware of its responsibility to
identify any obstacles to the convening of a World Disarmament Conference. It was
clear that the majority of Member States favoured the holding of such a
conference. The Committee should endeavour to define the conditions required for
the convening of a conference and, if necessary, set forth the reasons why such a
conference could not be convened. Further negotiations were obviously needed at
all levels. Care should be taken not to disguise the fact that there were
obstacles to the convening of the Conference, and it was essential to know
exactly what those obstacles were. Disarmament was one of the major problems
facing all countries, and the Committee should try to clear the way for its solution.

He wished to state his Government's preliminary views on some of the suggestions made at the current meeting. The documentation proposed by the representatives of Argentina and Mexico would undoubtedly be helpful, but it would be most costly and lengthy to prepare. Furthermore, it might duplicate urgent work which should be done by the secretariat of the Committee. He had some misgivings about the idea of a summary, since experience showed that great care was needed in such work so as not to distort the meaning of a statement. He therefore proposed that the Secretariat should propose an index of the statements made on the question of disarmament and related problems since 1971 in the plenary Assembly and the First and Second Committees, referring to the document symbol, the page number and the name of the country concerned. There should be general headings which would make it possible to find out who had made statements on certain subjects and what they had said.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that his suggestion, supplemented by those of the Chairman, was that the Secretariat should produce a summary document by the beginning of June which would be circulated to all United Nations delegations and not only to members of the Ad Hoc Committee. Delegations could then submit comments which the Secretariat would take into account when finalizing the summary as a working paper for the Committee. Such a document could be helpful to those delegations which did not have either the time or the staff to consult the many documents which would be mentioned in the index. He was certain that the Committee could trust the objectivity and discretion of the Secretariat in compiling such a document.

The representative of Italy had expressed precisely the idea that he himself had already mentioned, namely, that the views of States should be classified by subject headings and by country.

Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) said that he was not opposed to entrusting the Secretariat with the compilation of a summary; he was merely apprehensive about the way in which it would carry out that task. In his view, the only person who could successfully summarize a statement was the person who had made it.
The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the lateness of the hour, the Committee should postpone its decision on the various proposals before it until the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.
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**ORGANIZATION OF WORK (continued)**

Mr. SMID (Czechoslovakia) said that the development of events in recent years was evidence of how urgent it was to convene a world disarmament conference. The majority of States, as well as the peace movements, supported the idea of holding such a conference, and its speedy convocation had been advocated by the participants in the Fourth Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, which had been held in Algiers, and by the participants in the World Congress of Peace Forces, which had been held in Moscow. The deliberations of the General Assembly at its recent sessions and the resolutions it had adopted, as well as the work of the Special Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, had evidenced that the majority of States agreed that preparations should be started for organizing the conference.

The deliberations of the Special Committee had laid the groundwork for a constructive exchange of opinions among Member States on the question of the preparations for the convening of the conference. The question of the participation of other States in the work of the Committee had been resolved, and the terms of reference of the Committee were set out in General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII).

The position of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic regarding the convening of the conference, its agenda and the results it should achieve was recorded in the official documents of the United Nations as well as in numerous statements of the Czechoslovak Government and its representatives. He would, however, like to sum up that position very briefly. Peaceful coexistence among States with differing social systems was accompanied by a trend towards détente and created favourable prerequisites for achieving progress with regard to disarmament. The United Nations was the place for considerations on how that favourable situation might be used to implement disarmament measures. The Organization must assist in finding such measures and must exert efforts towards their speedy implementation.

/...
(Mr. Smid, Czechoslovakia)

The questions pertaining to disarmament should be very thoroughly dealt with in a special forum open to all States, and in the opinion of his delegation that forum should be the world disarmament conference. The Czechoslovak Government stood ready to participate actively in the constructive consideration of the questions pertaining to disarmament: general and complete disarmament, which represented the final goal, and partial measures of disarmament leading towards the attainment of that goal. It attached key importance to nuclear disarmament and believed that all nuclear Powers should participate in the preparations for the conference and in the conference itself.

The agreement and co-operation of States possessing nuclear weapons would contribute towards the preparations for and the work of the conference. In that context, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic fully supported negotiations between the nuclear Powers as well as the idea of convening a conference of those Powers. It was gratified to note that the talks between the USSR and the United States on the limitation of strategic arms were continuing. Those talks showed that, given a realistic approach, agreements on disarmament between nuclear Powers were feasible.

To fulfil its mandate, the Ad Hoc Committee must study all the views and proposals of Member States concerning the organization, agenda and the manner of deliberation of the conference. The primary task of the Committee was to sum up those views, to analyse them and to submit concrete proposals to the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session. His delegation was resolved to spare no effort in order that the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee might be fruitful. It wished to reserve its right to speak further on those questions at a later stage.

Mr. Rydbeck (Sweden) said that he would limit his remarks to the question of the organization of work, inasmuch as his Government had already made known its views on the convening of the conference in its reply to the questionnaire sent to it by the Secretary-General in pursuance of paragraph 4 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII).

The Committee's terms of reference were clearly defined in operative paragraph 1 of that resolution. Although the terms of reference might appear to be modest in scope, the Committee, by complying with them, would enable a
decisive step to be taken. The Committee must therefore determine how it could work with the greatest efficiency. His delegation accordingly supported the Mexican proposal, for the Committee must be able to have a sufficiently condensed document at its disposal if the short time available to it was to be used profitably. His delegation would also like the summary to provide a subject and country classification as a means of facilitating the Committee's work. It also supported the Chairman's suggestion that the summary should be in the form of a draft text which would be circulated as soon as possible to the members of the Committee and to the Governments of the Member States which had communicated their views and suggestions to the Secretary-General. The proposal for an index was also acceptable, but the index, if it was to serve a useful purpose, could not replace the summary. The summary should, of course, be exclusively concerned with the question of convening the conference and should be limited to concrete views on concrete subjects. To treat of the more general or the philosophical aspects of the disarmament question would be pointless, as the various Governments had had many opportunities to make known their views on that subject.

The Swedish delegation likewise supported the idea of establishing a working group which could start work on its draft report when the document requested of the Secretariat had been prepared. It believed, as did the representative of Algeria, that the working group should define the areas in which agreement appeared possible and should indicate what difficulties stood in the way of convening a world disarmament conference.

He was convinced that the high quality of the Committee's work would enable the Committee to gain the respect and trust of all those who viewed the convening of a disarmament conference with foreboding or scepticism. For that to be possible, its deliberations must from the outset be practical and concrete in character; that was why the Swedish delegation supported the Mexican and Argentine proposals.

Mr. RAÉ (Canada) recalled that his country's position on a world disarmament conference had been set out in: document A/3817, dated 31 August 1972; a statement made by the representative of Canada on 26 October 1972; a statement made on 26 April 1973 in the course of the informal
consultations of the Special Committee; and the statement made by the representative of Canada on the occasion of the adoption of the draft resolution submitted by Mexico on the subject of the world disarmament conference. At the time of the adoption of the resolution in question, Canada had stated that it was prepared to support the convening of a world disarmament conference if the broadest participation, including that of all nuclear Powers, could be achieved.

All were aware of the specific but important character of the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee as stated in operative paragraphs 1 and 3 of the resolution which was the essential authority. In explaining Canada's position in the General Assembly on 13 December last, his delegation had clearly put forward the view that the Ad Hoc Committee was not a preparatory commission for a World Disarmament Conference. Canada's views on the nature and composition of such a preparatory commission were set out in the relevant documents and statements to which he had referred.

With regard to the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, it would be very useful, as had been proposed by the representative of Mexico, for the Committee to have at its disposal a document in which the views of all Governments would be summarized. It would also be useful, as proposed by the representative of Italy, for the summary to be arranged in such a way as to facilitate the Ad Hoc Committee's consideration of all the questions on which it must report to the General Assembly. Without making any proposal, he pointed out several categories and titles that appeared in the questionnaire that had been sent to States by the Secretary-General; the questionnaire could thus serve as the basis for setting up further headings. While the Argentine representative's suggestion had also been useful, it might be preferable to have a summary of the opinions of the various States before giving thought to the establishment of a working group.

Mr. PEREZ DE CUELLAR (Peru) recalled that his country's position on the convening of a world disarmament conference was recorded in the meeting records of the twenty-sixth, twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth sessions of the General Assembly. That position remained unchanged.
Commenting on the terms of reference of the Ad Hoc Committee, he said that while they appeared to be of a procedural nature, their scope was actually quite broad. That was so because the obstacles to the convening of a world disarmament conference were not procedural obstacles but rather difficulties of a political character which derived from the different attitudes towards the conference that had been taken by the nuclear Powers. Once the political problems had been resolved, the procedural problems would disappear. The fact that by adopting resolution 3183 (XXVIII) the five Powers had undertaken to remain in contact with the Ad Hoc Committee was a good sign. The real work of the Committee would probably take place outside the Committee itself - in other words, in its informal contacts with the nuclear Powers. The Committee's terms of reference did not therefore reveal the true significance of its work. Excessive importance must not be given to its methods of work. While the proposals made at the preceding meeting did have certain advantages, they were relevant to the Committee's terms of reference only in so far as those terms of reference were interpreted literally. It would be better for the members of the Committee and the other Member States to summarize the views which had been expressed by them regarding the conference. That method of procedure would not only relieve the Secretariat of a burden but it would also enable the Committee to dispense with revising the document. While the preparation of a document on the basis of the statements that had already been made would certainly enable various currents of opinion to be identified, the real purpose at issue was not so much to examine the ideas which had already been expressed but rather to move forward in order to bring about conditions that would enable the conference to be held.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said he believed that the representative of Peru had put the question in a very clear perspective, for he himself also felt that the political aspect took precedence over procedural considerations. That was why, at the preceding meeting, he had proposed that the views of the nuclear Powers should be sought. Such an approach would make it possible to present the General Assembly with options that would enable progress to be made towards the convening of the conference. That was not to say that procedural questions should be neglected; it was merely an admonition not to forget that the main problem was not to choose the site and the rules of procedure of the conference but to obtain the co-operation of the five nuclear Powers. The essence of the
(Mr. Driss, Tunisia)

matter was to bring closer together the differing points of view. It was therefore absolutely indispensable for the political aspect of the question to be taken into account.

Mr. ZULETA (Colombia) said that he would like to speak about the summary proposed by the representative of Mexico which would constitute the working document of the Committee. Any difficulties with the arrangement of the elements of that summary could perhaps be resolved to some extent by referring to General Assembly resolution 2833 (XXVI), which contained a list of questions that had served as a basis for consulting and eliciting opinions from the delegations of Member States. Paragraph 2 of that resolution contained a list of six topics on which Governments had given their opinions either in documents which had been issued in 1972 or in the course of statements made in the First Committee of the General Assembly. Hence, if the proposal by the representative of Mexico was adopted, the aforementioned resolution could be taken as a basis for the classification of the elements of the summary that was to be prepared.

Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) said that he fully shared the Swedish representative's views regarding the work of the Committee. He also agreed with the observations by the representatives of Peru and Tunisia, which had raised questions that affected the very essence of the problem.

To begin with, the Committee could, in a flexible and empirical way, follow the various suggestions that had been made by some members, until such time as more concrete results emerged from the contacts to be established by the officers of the Committee. The efforts of the Committee would in any event be pointless without the co-operation of the great nuclear Powers, since they were the ones that had the weapons. Their help was essential because peace and security were at issue and also because those States had certain responsibilities under the Charter and were permanent members of the Security Council. Furthermore, as had been pointed out at the recent special session of the General Assembly, the arms race was an obstacle to development.

His country's position was clear: it supported any measure intended to achieve disarmament and any action that would be taken by the Committee with the
same aim; it had also expressed its support for the convening of a world disarmament conference.

Mr. AWOPETU (Nigeria) said that he supported the two proposals that had previously been made—the one for the preparation of a summary of the views of Governments, and the other for the establishment of a working group. Furthermore, his delegation believed that the work accomplished by the Special Committee which had been established the previous year might be helpful to the Ad Hoc Committee in the preparation of its summary.

Care must be taken not to spend too much time on questions of procedure; more attention must be given to the political aspect of the problem. As had been stated by the representative of Tunisia, the nuclear Powers must be urged to co-operate with the Committee and to make known their views.

His delegation would have other comments to make when matters of substance were discussed.

Mr. van der KLAAUW (Netherlands) said he supported the idea of a summary of the views of Governments and hoped that it would also reflect the views of the nuclear Powers. In the meantime, however, it would be advisable to have informal contacts with those Powers. The summary would enable the Committee to work in greater depth at its June session and then prepare the report that was to be submitted to the General Assembly. A working group might be useful to assist the Bureau in its work.

Mr. SIKAULU (Zambia) supported the proposals made by Argentina and Mexico at the previous meeting and reserved the right to make a more detailed statement at the June session.

The CHAIRMAN noted that a majority of Committee members supported the Mexican proposal to the effect, first, that the Secretariat should compile an index indicating the relevant documents, which would enable delegations to refer easily to the various statements by member States on the convening of a world disarmament conference and, secondly, that there should be a summary of statements and communications made since the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly. In view of the difficulty of the task, some delegations had proposed that the
(The Chairman)

Secretariat should request delegations themselves to send a summary of their views. In that case the summary could not be ready before the end of May, since contact would also have to be made with States which were not members of the Committee. It would therefore be better to ask the Secretariat to reproduce, in summary form, the key passages in Government statements. The document would merely be a draft that would be circulated to all members of the Committee, and to all the other Members of the Organization, so that they could make corrections to it if necessary. The Committee would then have an acceptable document that would serve as a basis for its deliberations at the June session.

It had been suggested that the index and the summary should be divided into sections. He recalled that the representative of Colombia had referred, in that connexion, to the list appearing in paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 2833 (XXVI). Some delegations had questioned the usefulness of the headings used, pointing out that the Committee was not yet a preparatory committee. He therefore suggested that the Bureau should be left to give the Secretariat provisional instructions on the subject, taking into account the statements made in the Committee. He also suggested that the Committee should adopt the Mexican proposal.

Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) thought that all aspects of the question mentioned by Members of the United Nations should be covered. The headings would emerge of their own accord from the positions adopted by the various Member States.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that that was precisely the purpose of the index, which would refer to the pages and paragraphs of documents in which Governments had expressed their views on a particular problem. It would therefore be preferable, in the summary, to use headings.

Mr. ZULETA (Colombia) thought that, for the purpose of deciding on the section headings, it would be possible to use a model other than that appearing in paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 2833 (XXVI). His delegation could agree to the suggestion that the Bureau should establish the classification.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) said that, to avoid dwelling further on the question, the Committee could agree to the Chairman's suggestion that the Bureau should draw up the list of topics.

Mr. JOB (Yugoslavia) said he fully supported the Chairman's proposal and the suggestion by the representative of Argentina. He felt that the summary
should indicate the views emerging from statements and communications by Governments. The summary could also mention the views expressed at various intergovernmental conferences on the subject of convening a world disarmament conference. The Secretariat might list, in an annex, the intergovernmental conferences that had been held over the past two years, giving the name of the conference, the date and place at which it was held, a list of participants and the comments made on that occasion concerning the world disarmament conference.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat could also take account of the statements made at the Geneva Disarmament Conference. The various headings would automatically suggest themselves when the Secretariat prepared the proposed document.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) thought that the Committee should still specify what information would be useful to it in its further work. It should be borne in mind that the documents in question would be a working document to which it should be possible to refer in the future. In any case he had full confidence in the Bureau's discretion in making the selection.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that ultimately it was for the Committee to make the decision.

Mr. QADRUDDIN (Pakistan) said that the index itself would involve a number of headings. With regard to the summary requested of the Secretariat it should, first, indicate the points on which agreement seemed to be reached and secondly, and most important, the areas in which there were differing views, mainly of a political nature.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should go on to consider the Argentine proposal concerning the establishment of a small working group to draft a report for the Committee.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) asked the representative of Argentina to explain what he thought the composition and terms of reference of the working group should be.
Mr. Ortiz de Rozas (Argentina) said he had no preconceived ideas about the composition of the group. It might be envisaged as a small group of 8 to 10 members, selected in accordance with the principle of equitable geographical distribution. Its terms of reference would be to prepare, on the basis of the documents prepared by the Secretariat and other relevant documents (for example, statements by non-aligned countries at the Disarmament Conference), a draft report which the Committee would adopt by consensus before transmitting it to the General Assembly.

It would also be as well to set the date for the meeting of the working group. As several delegations had remarked, it could not logically begin its work until the documents to be produced by the Secretariat were available. There were two possible solutions: it could meet after the issue of those documents but before the next session of the Committee, set for 24 June, or after that session, which might be a better solution.

Mr. Ghorra (Lebanon) supported the proposal by the representative of Argentina. However, with regard to the date for the meeting of the working group, he had some reservations regarding the preference which that representative seemed to have for the second solution. If the Committee did not consider the draft until after its June session, it might not be in the position to submit its report to the General Assembly within the time-limit required by its terms of reference, that is, at the twenty-ninth session.

Mr. Ortiz de Rozas (Argentina) said he had simply mentioned two possibilities without expressing any marked preference. However, he had happened to hear, in the course of informal conversations, a view which he considered very sensible: by postponing its meetings until after the June session the working group would be in a position to take account of the comments made not only at the present session but also at the following session of the Committee.

Mr. Driiss (Tunisia) said he found the idea of establishing a working group acceptable. But it would have to have material for a draft report and that would only be possible if the plenary Committee had been able to study the documents produced by the Secretariat and the views of the five nuclear States.
Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that he, like the representative of Lebanon, had the impression that the representative of Argentina favoured the second solution suggested. He had, moreover, given reasons for that choice, which seemed justified.

He himself thought that the question of the establishment of a working group could be considered at a later stage. The Committee had more urgent tasks which it should accomplish promptly if it wished to fulfil the mandate given to it by the General Assembly. Only after it had considered questions of substance and studied the position of the nuclear Powers — which would probably only be known unofficially — would the proposed group have a basis to work on, and only then could its establishment be usefully considered.

Mr. OVVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he thought there were merits in the idea of establishing a working group, but agreed with the representative of Argentina that its establishment must be contemplated without any preconceived ideas. Besides, it might be too soon to establish such a group. There was scarcely any reason for its existence until the Secretariat had prepared the documents requested and the Committee had considered, at its present session and its June session, the substantive questions posed by the convening of the Conference.

Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) said he fully appreciated the arguments put forward by the representatives of Argentina, Mexico and Tunisia. His delegation, as he had already stated, supported the Argentine proposal in principle and had raised the question of the date for the establishment of the working group only because the Committee, under its terms of reference, was to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session. If the working group did not begin to draft a report until after the June session, the Committee would have to meet again later on — and in any case before the next session of the General Assembly — to approve the text of the report.

Mr. RYDBERG (Sweden) said he supported the establishment of a working group, which might take place either at the present session or in June, on the clear understanding that the group would not begin its work until after the June session. It was hard to see how it could prepare a report without the necessary documents and before all the members of the plenary Committee had had an opportunity to state their views.
Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil) supported the Argentine proposal concerning the establishment of a working group although, like the representative of Tunisia, he felt that it should have something to work on. He recalled that the previous day the Committee had agreed that the Bureau should draw up a programme of work after hearing the suggestions of delegations. He thought that the Bureau should now be in a position to submit that programme to the Committee at its June session, and there would be time to consider the establishment of a working group on that occasion.

Mr. ÇUVEN (Turkey) said that he approved of the proposal to establish a working group but thought that the Committee would do well to postpone a decision on that point.

The CHAIRMAN said that it seemed clear from the discussion that all the members of the Committee supported the Argentine proposal to establish a small working group but that the majority of representatives would like its establishment to be postponed until the next session. He suggested that, in the meantime, delegations should agree on the composition of the group so that the Committee would not have to revert to that procedural question in June.

Many delegations had emphasized that it was very important for the Committee to be informed of the views of the five nuclear States. The representative of one of those five States had already made a preliminary statement at the previous meeting. The representatives of two other States were attending the Committee's meetings and therefore knew how anxious it was to learn their positions. As for the two other nuclear States which were not represented, he had suggested that he might himself make contact with them to inquire about their intentions concerning the co-operation referred to in operative paragraph 3 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII) and inform them of the Committee's wish to be acquainted with their views so that it could mention them in its report to the General Assembly.

Now that those procedural questions had been more or less settled, he hoped that the Committee would begin to discuss matters of substance so that it could make progress in its work before the June session and be in a position to know the reactions of the nuclear States.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.
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Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria) said that he would merely recall the major points of Austria's position on the convening of a World Disarmament Conference, since it had been explained on several occasions in various United Nations bodies. Since 1971, Austria had supported discussions on disarmament in the General Assembly, and it had sponsored a resolution at the twenty-sixth session. In 1972, his Government had sent a communication to the Secretary-General which was contained in document A/8817. He read out the relevant passages of that statement of his Government's views on the tasks and objectives of the conference (paragraph 2 (a)), its duration (paragraph 2 (d)) and participation in the conference (paragraph 3).

At the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly he had added a further point in the First Committee which he considered particularly important. He had referred to the frustration felt by those involved in disarmament negotiations within the United Nations over the lack of tangible results. Given that situation, it was scarcely surprising that institutional changes were requested with growing frequency and insistence. That was why his delegation had welcomed the efforts of the representative of Mexico to overcome the difficulties encountered by the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 2930 (XXVII) and establish the Ad Hoc Committee.

The mandate entrusted to the Ad Hoc Committee was set out in paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII). He was certain that the proposal of the representative of Mexico, adopted at the third meeting, would help the Committee to fulfil its mandate and provide the basis for a constructive discussion at its next session. In his delegation's view, the major problem facing the Committee was that of examining conditions for the realization of the Conference. A majority of States were agreed that a World Disarmament Conference should be held and could only be successful if all the nuclear Powers participated. However, the nuclear Powers were not all in favour of holding such a conference at the present
(Mr. Jankowitsch, Austria)

time. He pointed out that some delegations saw the Conference as a beginning while others saw it as a culmination of years of effort. It must be borne in mind that delegations' views on the conditions required for the convening of the Conference were therefore bound to differ. The Committee must give particular attention to that problem, and it must be cautious and patient if it was to reach a solution. In his delegation's view, the Chairman's proposal in that connexion appeared to incorporate the necessary elements.

As previous speakers had pointed out, the mandate entrusted to the Committee, although limited, was not unimportant. If the Committee succeeded in providing the basis for a General Assembly decision on the procedures for preparing a conference, it would have accomplished a great deal. However, it should not lose sight of its ultimate aim, which was disarmament and not merely the convening of a conference on the subject. His delegation hoped that the Committee would complete its examination of the views and suggestions expressed by Governments as soon as possible, so that it could begin the complex task of examining the conditions for the realization of the Conference without being pressed for time.

Mr. PUNTSAGNOROV (Mongolia) said that his Government's position on the problem of disarmament and related questions had been fully set out in the records of the United Nations General Assembly and of other international bodies concerned with the problem of disarmament, in particular the Geneva disarmament conference, and also in the replies and statements of his Government which had been distributed as official documents.

Mongolia had always actively supported any initiatives and proposals which genuinely contributed to progress towards general and complete disarmament. The idea of disarmament was now winning increasing support; the ruling circles and the public in many countries were coming to recognize the danger and absurdity of a situation in which hundreds of millions of dollars were being spent on armaments every year while at the same time, through the fault of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, two thirds of the world's population was vegetating in conditions of hunger and poverty. The idea of disarmament and the struggle for its speedy realization had therefore come to occupy a central place in the work of many international forums and meetings.
The successful adoption of partial measures to limit the arms race and to ban some weapons of mass destruction over the last few years has shown the potential and effectiveness of both bilateral and multilateral talks to achieve disarmament. The current favourable changes in the international political atmosphere and the consolidation of détente had strengthened the hope that it would be possible to reach an understanding on such a vital problem of contemporary life. In those conditions, it was absolutely essential to discuss the problems of disarmament at a high international level with the participation of all countries, large and small. That would spur countries to combine their efforts in seeking the most rational ways to limit the arms race and to discover and overcome the difficulties that were hindering the implementation of measures to bring about disarmament.

The General Assembly's adoption at its twenty-eighth session of resolution 3183 (XXVIII), pursuant to which the Ad Hoc Committee had been set up, was graphic proof that an overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations supported the idea of disarmament. Paragraph 3 of the resolution invited the States possessing nuclear weapons to co-operate or maintain contact with the Ad Hoc Committee, and he was pleased to see that representatives from the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France were present at the meeting and hoped that their example would be followed by the other nuclear Powers. The successful beginning of the Committee's work was a good augury.

Mr. ELLAS (Spain) said that his delegation's views had been clearly set forth in the First Committee and in replies addressed to the Secretary-General in accordance with the relevant resolutions. His delegation, like others, felt that it was important for the Committee to be aware of the content and limitations of its mandate, which included a material element - the opinions of Governments - and a formal element - the consensus to be reached on its report to the General Assembly. A consensus could not be achieved unless a spirit of agreement prevailed among members, but it would seem from the exchange of views to date that such a spirit did exist and would develop further.

The degree of responsibility borne by the various States in the matter of disarmament depended on the size of their arsenals and on their position in the international community. It was important to recognize that a certain balance of
(Mr. Elias, Spain)

power, however precarious, did exist and the Committee must adopt a realistic and patient approach. Too much stress must not be placed on the immediate convening of the Conference or on various pre-conditions which might have the effect of postponing it indefinitely.

The question of disarmament should be approached in stages. The first stage, in which the Committee now found itself, was the creation of conditions for the convening of the Conference; then would come the preparation and convening of the Conference, followed by the Conference itself. The ultimate objective was disarmament. Although the Ad Hoc Committee should not regard itself as the preparatory committee for the Conference it could carry out the preparatory work needed to create the conditions required to convene the Conference. Indeed, that was the mandate entrusted to it in paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII).

In his delegation's view, one of the first conditions for the convening of the Conference was the establishment of a system for co-ordinating disarmament efforts at various levels, bilateral, regional and international. The many activities already under way at the bilateral and regional levels, such as the SALT negotiations and the European security conference, should be taken into account in the Committee's work. Nor should the countries engaged in those negotiations forget that the international community represented on the Committee must deal with the problem of disarmament precisely because it was a world-wide problem. A system must be found for ensuring that those activities complemented each other and continued without interruption. The embryo of such a system was to be found in General Assembly resolution 3184 A and C (XXVIII). The most important task before the Committee was the development of a system for consultation and co-ordination which would take into account the very special responsibilities of certain countries and the rights of all, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.

Mr. DATCU (Romania) said that the Romanian position on the World Disarmament Conference was already set forth in several United Nations documents and he would not repeat it at the present stage. The convening of such a conference was a question of fundamental principle which his Government had
supported for many years. His delegation viewed the Conference in the general context of the establishment of relationships between all States on the basis of new principles which outlawed the use of force. Thus, disarmament should be the result of active efforts by all States and the Conference should be an important factor in mobilizing the political will of States to undertake effective disarmament measures. The Conference should be a well-prepared world forum, open to all States for participation on an equal basis, to consider the adoption of practical disarmament measures. It was his delegation's view that each step towards the convening of the Conference should be approved by consensus by all States, whether or not they possessed nuclear weapons.

Owing to the patient and persevering efforts of many delegations, particularly those of the non-aligned countries, the General Assembly had unanimously adopted resolution 3183 (XXVIII) establishing the Ad Hoc Committee. It was important to consolidate the advances made and to build on those foundations. Success, particularly in the field of disarmament, was dependent on the political will of States to reach a consensus and to work constructively, respecting each others' views, to achieve generally acceptable solutions. It was essential for the activities of the Ad Hoc Committee to be endorsed by all States, not only those that were members of the Committee. The latter's mandate, which was set out in paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII), was only a beginning, but it must be carried out to the letter.

He agreed with previous speakers that the Committee's task would be greatly facilitated if a Secretariat document of the kind proposed by the representative of Mexico could be made available to members. In his delegation's view, such a document should set out systematically the views, suggestions and proposals submitted by Member States not only in their replies to the Secretary-General in 1972 and 1974 but also in discussions during recent sessions of the General Assembly. The summary of those views could form the basis of the Committee's report to the General Assembly, which could contain such conclusions and recommendations as the Committee might wish to make. In conclusion, he said that his delegation would co-operate fully in accomplishing the tasks entrusted to the Committee.
Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the representative of Peru that the Committee's main task was to promote the convening of a World Disarmament Conference. His delegation did not consider that the Conference should be convened in the immediate future, since serious and careful preparations were needed for such a conference, difficulties had to be overcome and the participation of all States, including all the nuclear Powers, had to be ensured. It should nevertheless be borne in mind that the United Nations had been considering the question for three years, so that certain favourable prerequisites existed for initiating practical preparations.

As a result of the easing of international tension, some progress had been made in solving the difficulties concerning the scope of representation at the Conference. The German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany were now Members of the United Nations, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had full observer status. The extension of détente to the Indian subcontinent should result shortly in the admission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to membership of the United Nations. It was to be hoped that the end of the war in Viet-Nam would lead to the end of United Nations discrimination against the Democratic Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet-Nam.

With regard to contacts and co-operation with the nuclear Powers in the preparation and convening of the Conference, recently only one of the five nuclear Powers - the Soviet Union - had not only expressed support for the preparation of the Conference but had also participated actively in efforts in that direction. Now that the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference had begun its work, two more nuclear Powers were attending its meetings. Obvious progress had been made in that regard. Additional factors gave grounds for hope that the two remaining nuclear Powers, which were not present at the meetings, would consider the mood of the United Nations as a whole and would also take a step forward towards meeting the universal wish.

Considerable progress had been made on a number of other questions linked with the convening of the Conference.

Although the picture was not yet quite clear regarding the actual date and place of the Conference, there was in practice no disagreement on such matters as the length of the Conference. Some progress had also been made with regard to the
agenda of the Conference. Thus the difficulties which inevitably arose in the preparation of such a major international gathering were gradually disappearing, Member States and world public opinion were becoming increasingly aware of the need for a disarmament conference.

The Committee should be able to achieve favourable results since it was composed of representatives of one third of the membership of the United Nations. All the regional groups in the Organization and all the continents of the world were represented on it, as were two thirds of the nuclear Powers. It was clear from the discussion which had already taken place that the members of the Committee were approaching the solution of the question of the convening of a World Disarmament Conference with a feeling of great responsibility, bearing in mind the need to ensure that the international gathering was used for serious and thorough discussion of the whole range of disarmament problems and for the achievement of progress towards their solution.

It was also very gratifying that at the previous meeting there had been a consensus on the subject of some procedural questions concerning the future work of the Committee. The Mexican representative had made a very useful proposal that the Secretariat should prepare a document summarizing the views and suggestions of Member States on the question of a World Disarmament Conference, as expressed at the previous three sessions of the Assembly and in the replies of States to the Secretary-General's well-known inquiries. He also shared the Yugoslav representative's view that the document should include the views and suggestions put forward at major international conferences and forums and felt that extracts from the decisions adopted at the World Congress of Peace Forces should be included. He agreed with the representative of Nigeria that the document should contain the views expressed by members of the earlier Special Committee in 1973, when support for the idea of convening a World Disarmament Conference had clearly emerged. The discussions in that Committee and subsequent statements at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly enabled the Ad Hoc Committee to consider specific issues now without holding a general discussion.

With regard to the technical aspects of the document to be prepared by the Secretariat, he felt that it would be useful if each section could be either prefaced or followed by a brief summary of the views expressed in it. The question of how many sections there should be, and what titles they should be given, should
not present any great difficulties and could be decided by consensus. An index to the documentation concerning the World Disarmament Conference would also be useful. He agreed with the representative of Mexico that the Secretariat document should be made available to all Members of the United Nations so that it would not only constitute the basis of the Committee's work but also enable Members to be better prepared to discuss the matter at the regular session of the General Assembly.

The Soviet delegation also noted the Committee's decision to consider at its next session the Argentine proposal concerning the establishment of a working group of members of the Committee to draft its report to the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at noon.
5th meeting

Chairman: Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK (concluded)

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that, in pursuance of the task entrusted to them, the officers had drawn up, in consultation with the Secretariat, a list of headings to assist the latter in classifying the statements and communications of Member States concerning the convening of a world disarmament conference. On the basis of the replies to the questionnaire sent to Member States in 1971, the replies to Secretariat letters sent in 1972 and 1973, and the views expressed by Member States at the current session of the Ad Hoc Committee, the officers proposed the following list: (1) General views and suggestions as well as the conditions for the realization of the conference; (2) Principal objectives of the conference; (3) Adequate preparations for the conference; (4) Agenda for the conference; (5) Organization of the conference, divided into three subsections, namely (a) administrative questions, (b) structure, functions and procedure, and (c) relations of the conference with the United Nations; (6) Other questions.

He emphasized that the foregoing list could in no way be considered an agenda for the Ad Hoc Committee since, under General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII), the Committee’s mandate did not involve its acting as a preparatory committee for the conference.

He also pointed out that the list should not be regarded as exhaustive. The Secretariat, in consultation with the officers of the Committee, could if necessary add further subheadings in the light of the views of Governments.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina), while supporting the proposal by the officers of the Committee, proposed that the first heading should also include a reference to "related problems", since those words were already included in paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) and since a number of delegations, including his own, had already referred to such problems during the debates in the First Committee and in the course of bilateral negotiations.
Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) fully endorsed the proposed list as amended by the representative of Argentina. He also agreed with the Chairman regarding the need to keep within the Committee's terms of reference. However, it was correct to include also the replies of Governments to questionnaires sent to Member States in 1972 and 1973, since General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) specifically stated that the Committee should examine all the views and suggestions expressed by Governments on the question.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), while agreeing in principle with the proposal by the officers of the Committee, said he had the impression that it was an overly cautious one. He agreed that the proposed heading should not be regarded as an agenda for the Committee or as in any way prejudging the question of convening the conference.

The Committee must proceed in an orderly way by complying with its terms of reference, giving a clear account of the views and suggestions of Governments during the period covering the past three sessions of the General Assembly. However, some members of the Committee had expressed the wish that the document to be prepared by the Secretariat should reflect not only the written replies of Governments and their statements in the General Assembly but also their views as expressed in the course of the unofficial discussions held by the Special Committee on the World Disarmament Conference established under General Assembly resolution 2930 (XXVII). In addition, the document should include the main decisions of important representative international forums such as the Conferences of Non-Aligned Countries, at one of which the convening of a world disarmament conference had first been proposed. The view had also been advanced during the discussions in the Committee that a brief reference should be included in the proposed document to the views expressed in other important international forums, such as the World Congress of Peace Forces held at Moscow in 1973, and the views of the veterans of the Second World War referred to in his first statement in the Committee.

The incorporation of the various views to which he had referred would provide a broader picture of the whole question of a disarmament conference, in which the peoples of the whole world were showing increasing interest.
The CHAIRMAN agreed with the USSR representative that the Committee should not be unduly cautious in its approach. As to the unofficial discussions held by the Special Committee in 1973, he agreed that many valuable ideas had been put forward; he pointed out, however, that the discussions had indeed been unofficial and that, since he had led the discussions, his delegation had taken the responsibility for circulating the records of the discussions to the members of the Special Committee. It would therefore be incorrect to transmit to the Secretariat the records of those meetings.

As to the views expressed at the Conferences of Non-Aligned Countries, he felt that the Secretariat would have no great difficulty in studying them but only to the extent that it had received copies of the relevant documents.

He agreed with the USSR representative regarding the importance of the World Congress of Peace Forces and other such forums but felt that the views of non-governmental organizations fell outside the Committee's terms of reference. In that regard, however, the Committee might decide otherwise.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said he hoped that the USSR representative would not press for the inclusion of the views expressed in the unofficial discussions held in the Special Committee in 1973. That would complicate the Committee's task without adding any new elements. He felt that the scope of the proposed Secretariat paper, which should be prepared as soon as possible, should be restricted to what his delegation had had in mind when proposing the preparation of the document, namely the views and suggestions expressed by Governments either in their replies to the questionnaires concerning a disarmament conference. The document could, however, include any additional replies from Governments received during the current year.

He agreed that the initiative for proposing a world disarmament conference had been taken by the non-aligned countries some 10 years earlier. He would accordingly have no objection if the proposed Secretariat document were to be followed by an addendum containing the views expressed at the Conferences of Non-Aligned Countries. In that way, the preparation of the basic document would not be delayed.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the unofficial exchange of views held in 1973 in the Special Committee under the
leadership of Ambassador Hoveyda had been an exchange of views by official
government representatives; he fully supported the inclusion of those views - as
originally proposed by the delegation of Nigeria - but would not press the proposal.

He agreed with the representative of Mexico regarding the distribution of an
addendum which would include the views expressed at the Conferences of Non-Aligned
Countries. However, in order to ensure that it was linked with the basic
Secretariat document, the addendum could very usefully include the background to
the question of convening the conference.

The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that
the Committee wished to adopt the proposal made by the officers of the Committee,
as supplemented by the proposals of the delegations of Argentina, the USSR and
Mexico.

It was so decided.

EXAMINATION OF ALL THE VIEWS AND SUGGESTIONS EXPRESSED BY GOVERNMENTS ON THE
CONVENING OF A WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE AND RELATED PROBLEMS, INCLUDING
CONDITIONS FOR THE REALIZATION OF SUCH A CONFERENCE (A/AC.167/L.2; A/9590)

Mr. KULAGA (Poland) noted that the Committee had two sets of problems to
tackle: problems of an organizational nature and those of a substantive nature.
Both types of problems were political. Organizational matters were clearly
subordinate to substantive questions, but they were nevertheless important to the
attainment of the Committee's goal. His delegation supported the Mexican
representative's proposal that the Secretariat should compile a document as the
basis for the Committee's work. The document would be a reflection of political
thinking within the United Nations and other organizations, both intergovernmental
and non-governmental, on the all-important matter of a world disarmament conference
and would also be a useful reference basis for the Committee's work. With regard
to the proposal to set up a working group, he felt that it would be wise to refer
consideration of that idea to the Committee's June session, by which time it would
be in a better position to take the appropriate decisions. However, both proposals
were concerned with the ways and means of facilitating the Committee's substantive
work of reaching its objective, namely to accelerate progress in disarmament
through the convening of a world disarmament conference. In order to achieve that
aim, it was necessary to build upon the results which had already been achieved as far as common ideas and convergent views were concerned and also to concert efforts for the removal of obstacles.

The history of the efforts made to convene a world disarmament conference showed that the idea had steadily gained momentum and that it was sound. It had taken 10 years for the European Conference on Security and Co-operation to be organized since the time when the idea had first been put forward at the United Nations by his delegation, and it was to be hoped that the idea of a world disarmament conference, first endorsed by the United Nations in 1965, would soon be realized. However, a review of the history of the item under discussion also showed that there had been considerable resistance to the proposal. It was from this resistance, and not from any one decision, that the difficulties experienced in particular in 1973 had stemmed.

Poland had always actively supported and, whenever possible, initiated measures in the field of disarmament and had done so at the subregional, regional, and universal levels, within and outside the United Nations. Active advocacy of disarmament had been a constant feature of socialist Poland's foreign policy throughout the 30 years of its existence. His Government hoped and was convinced that the process of détente would be further consolidated and that political détente would be matched by military détente in the field of disarmament, thus contributing to social and economic progress: that preoccupation was the central theme of the sixth Special Session of the General Assembly.

His delegation was pleased to note the presence of representatives of three of the States possessing nuclear weapons at the meeting and welcomed their contribution to the Committee's work. It was essential that all the nuclear Powers should participate in a world disarmament conference. His delegation had always maintained the view that there was a need for their co-operation in the preparations for such a conference, and he hoped that the two other nuclear Powers would join the Committee in its efforts.

His delegation's views on specific aspects of the world disarmament conference were set out in the reply which the Polish Government had recently sent to the Secretary-General in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) supplementing the communication sent to the Secretary-General in 1972. It would assist the work of the Committee if all replies from Governments could be received as soon as possible.
Mr. JOZAK (Hungary) said that the recently ended sixth special session of the General Assembly had highlighted the world's great need for resources for the purposes of peaceful development, and the Committee should therefore do its utmost to reduce the enormous sums spent on armaments. The convening of a world disarmament conference would be the best possible move in that direction. The unanimous adoption of resolution 3183 (XXVIII) by the General Assembly was a good omen for the Committee's success, and difficulties such as the under-representation of certain regions, which had hindered previous preparatory work seemed to have been overcome.

Hungary had always maintained that general and complete disarmament would represent the greatest possible contribution to the easing of international tension and the strengthening of mutual trust between States. His Government's views had been communicated to the Secretary-General and could be found in a number of official United Nations documents, and the Hungarian Foreign Minister, in his statement at the sixth special session, had emphasized the urgent need to end the arms race and reduce military budgets. His Government was convinced that disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, was in the real interest of all people, and it therefore strongly supported all steps in that direction.

His delegation supported the proposal to set up a working group and thought that its members should be elected at the June session. He also agreed with the proposal that the Secretariat should prepare a draft paper containing all the views and suggestions expressed by Governments and felt that the sooner the draft could be prepared, the better.

Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India) said that his delegation's views on the subject of the convening of a world disarmament conference were well known as they had been stated in considerable detail in the First Committee at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly; moreover, his Government's views and suggestions had been communicated to the Secretary-General in September 1972 pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2833 (XXVI) and had been reproduced in document A/8817. His Government continued to hold those views.

India was convinced that a world disarmament conference would promote the cause of general and complete disarmament provided that adequate preparations were made with the participation of all States. The primary objective of the conference
would, of course, be nuclear disarmament, and the participation of all States, particularly the nuclear Powers, was absolutely essential. Any worthwhile step in the direction of disarmament must, in the view of his Government, be taken under effective international control. The discussions at the conference should cover the entire range of problems relating to disarmament, including partial and collateral measures. The goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control would have to be kept in view, while realizing that it could be achieved only in gradual stages, ending finally in the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction or mutilation.

If the vast amounts spent on armaments annually by the world community could be even partially diverted to raise the standard of living of underprivileged people throughout the world, substantial advances could be made towards the elimination of poverty, hunger and disease. It was essential to make progress towards disarmament in the interests of stability and of strengthening détente.

Although the need for disarmament was realized by most countries, the lack of progress in disarmament negotiations had been disappointing. It had to be recognized that the problems of disarmament were complex and that persistent efforts had to continue in order to find adequate solutions to the difficulties which were encountered on matters of procedure as well as substance. The main immediate problem was to ensure the participation of the two other nuclear weapons States in the Committee's work and later at the world disarmament conference. The real reason for the lack of progress in disarmament negotiations was the suspicion and mistrust among nations regarding what each considered to be its vital security interests; for that reason, disarmament negotiations must involve all countries, particularly those which were militarily significant.

He agreed that a summary should be prepared of the views of Member States on a world disarmament conference and that it should be prepared on a comparative basis under suitable headings. He also agreed that a comprehensive index should be prepared. The suggestion regarding the appointment of a working group was valuable; as a smaller body, the group would be able to contact delegations and negotiate with them more quickly and with greater flexibility and chances of success.
(Mr. Chakravarty, India)

The discussions at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly and also the replies received by the Secretary-General with regard to the convening of a world disarmament conference indicated clearly that a large majority of Member States were in favour of convening such a conference; he therefore hoped that, in view of the importance of disarmament to all Member States and to mankind as a whole, the two other nuclear Powers would co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee and later participate in the world disarmament conference.

Mr. ABDULDJALIL (Indonesia) said that his Government's support for the proposal to convene a world disarmament conference had been clearly stated on previous occasions. The convening of such a conference at the present stage of disarmament negotiations would generate new impetus towards the adoption of effective measures.

There were, of course, immense difficulties, including the major problem of the political differences between the great Powers on the question of convening a world disarmament conference. The Committee's main task was therefore to seek an accommodation between the great Powers, and it should specifically seek their views regarding the conditions under which they would be willing to participate in the conference and co-operate with the Committee. He felt that the proposal that the Secretariat should prepare a summary of the views of Governments was a constructive one which would facilitate the Committee's task. However, the Committee should be clear about the points to be summarized; the summary should be divided into categories such as objectives, conditions, preparatory aspects and other matters. The establishment of a working group would also greatly facilitate the Committee's task, particularly in the preparation of its report to the General Assembly; however, if the working group was to be set up after the June session, it would be advisable to postpone any discussion on its organization until a later date. That would give more time to consider the issues which required the Committee's immediate attention.

Mr. CHELEV (Bulgaria) said that, in the three years since the General Assembly had first endorsed the idea of a world disarmament conference in resolution 2833 (XXVI), a considerable amount of work had been done and the directives of that resolution had been largely implemented. The views of States on
the convening of the conference, its aims, its agenda and many other questions were
reflected in the replies which Governments had sent to the Secretary-General, and
those views had been further amplified during discussions at the twenty-seventh
and twenty-eighth sessions of the General Assembly and also in the Special
Committee set up in accordance with resolution 2930 (XXVII). The idea of convening
a world disarmament conference had gained support and was now whole-heartedly
advocated by world public opinion and by the vast majority of States. He agreed
with the representative of Algeria that it was significant that the idea of
convening a world disarmament conference had survived, and it was now necessary to
realize it. The views expressed in favour of convening such a conference in
international forums outside the United Nations, particularly at the Fourth
Conference of Non-Aligned States and the World Congress of Peace Forces at Moscow,
constituted very important preparatory work which should be taken into consideration
by the Committee in preparing its report to the General Assembly. The proposed
summary to be prepared by the Secretariat would also provide a very useful over-all
picture of the views of various countries on the matter and of the political
background, and it would be a good basis for the Committee's work.

The work which the Committee had already achieved was very encouraging; it
had reached decisions which went beyond the purely procedural aspects of the matter
and paved the way for the implementation of the resolutions of three consecutive
sessions of the General Assembly on the subject of convening a world disarmament
conference. He agreed with the representative of Peru that the Committee should not
interpret its mandate literally but should bear in mind throughout its deliberations
that the ultimate goal of its work was to hasten the convening of the conference.

His Government's position on the question of convening a world disarmament
conference was contained in its reply to the Secretary-General pursuant to
resolution 2833 (XXVI) and had been restated in debates at the twenty-seventh and
twenty-eighth sessions of the General Assembly. Socialist Bulgaria whole-heartedly
supported the Soviet Union's initiative in proposing that a world disarmament
conference should be convened because of its firm conviction that there must be a
redoubled effort to bring about effective disarmament and that the problems of
(Mr. Cheley, Bulgaria)
disarmament must be given priority consideration. Over the past decade, and particularly during the last few years, considerable experience had been accumulated in international disarmament negotiations, and that experience had shown that in order to make progress it was necessary to negotiate on the basis of a firm desire to achieve disarmament and that the ending of the arms race and disarmament were difficult but attainable aims. A number of international agreements on the limitation of the arms race which had at one time seemed unrealizable had been concluded, and that encouraged the hope that decisive results could be achieved if all aspects of the problems of disarmament were examined in depth with the participation of all States without exception on an equal footing, particularly the nuclear Powers. The problem of disarmament was indisputably an important part of the problem of establishing peace and stability, as had been emphasized in resolution 3185 (XXVIII) on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

At a time when the trend in international relations was towards peace and détente, conditions were propitious for the redoubling of efforts in the sphere of disarmament. Favourable results at a disarmament conference would stimulate disarmament negotiations and open up vast possibilities for progress towards disarmament and, above all, towards nuclear disarmament. The conference could well be a turning point in the ending of the arms race.

The very important decisions adopted at the recently concluded sixth special session required practical implementation. The surest way to achieve that was through disarmament and the consolidation of peace. The ending of the arms race must necessarily become a component of the new economic order, for disarmament would release vast resources for development. Despite its limited mandate, the Committee had a very important task to fulfil. Its work was so vital to all peoples and countries, large and small, that it must not permit itself to be thwarted by difficulties, scepticism and even ill will.

It was essential that all the nuclear Powers should participate in the work of the Committee. He was pleased to see that three of them were attending its meetings and hoped that the other two would speedily respond to the general desire that they should participate in the preparations for convening a world disarmament conference. That would be in keeping with the spirit of resolution 3183 (XXVIII), which had been unanimously adopted by the General Assembly.
Mr. EMANY (Zaire) said that his country, situated in an area of the world where Portugal, aided by its NATO allies, was continuing an inhuman colonial war, was understandably concerned with the problem of disarmament. Furthermore, in order for South Africa to acquire experience in aerial combat - one did not know for what purpose - South African fighter planes had participated, on the Israeli side, in the recent Middle East conflict and had landed in Portuguese territories in Africa before rejoining the flood of aircraft from the Azores. He pointed out the illogicality of a situation in which the international community rightly condemned the arms race while certain Powers continued to provide Portugal and the white minorities in South Africa and Rhodesia with arms to suppress the African peoples which sought freedom. A further example of that illogicality was the plan to enlarge the air and naval base at Diego Garcia, and also the activities of warships in the Indian Ocean, in flagrant violation of General Assembly resolution 3080 (XXVIII). Furthermore, nuclear tests were continuing despite numerous United Nations resolutions. In such a situation, it might well be asked what the Committee could hope to do. However, his delegation firmly believed that understanding would prevail over hegemonicist and other tendencies.

Zaire supported the suggestion made by the representative of Mexico and felt that a well-planned document summarizing the views of Governments would be very useful to the Committee in preparing its report to the General Assembly. The Committee's task was clearly defined in paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII), and the current situation was a great improvement over that of 1973.

Although some speakers had said that there were grounds for optimism regarding the convening of a world disarmament conference in the near future, he cautioned against overoptimism as long as the existing situation in southern Africa continued. Other speakers had stressed the need for meticulous preparation of the conference, which undoubtedly meant that it would be deferred. He called upon all parties to overcome the difficulties which separated them so that the conference, so long awaited by peace-loving peoples, could be held. Man had given proof of his abilities in other fields and should therefore be able to find a solution to the problem of disarmament and the threat of world destruction posed by the huge stockpiles of weapons. He was certain that the voice of reason would triumph and that the Committee would contribute to the building of a better world if it followed the approach suggested by the Chairman.

/...
(Mr. Emany, Zaire)

The Committee had begun its work under more favourable circumstances than the former Special Committee, and it was encouraging to note that three of the five nuclear Powers were attending its meetings. It was to be hoped that the two other nuclear Powers would join in its work in the not too distant future.

Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) pointed out that the mandate entrusted to the Committee under General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) was not purely procedural or technical. Although it was not the Committee's task to prepare for a world disarmament conference, the fact that it was to consider the conditions required for the realization of such a conference was a positive step towards its convening. Examination of those conditions was a political rather than a procedural task, particularly if the participation of all nuclear Powers was included as an essential condition, in accordance with paragraph 3 of the resolution. That was why he felt that the contacts to be made by the Bureau of the Committee, in accordance with his delegation's suggestion, were extremely important. The procedural aspects of the Committee's discussions should not detract from the essentially political element involved in establishing the required conditions for convening the conference.

His Government's position on the subject was sufficiently well known for him not to have to repeat it. However, he wished to underline some of the points raised by his delegation in the past. The world disarmament conference must be approached in the light of the urgent need to reconcile the interests of the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers. It must not be allowed to become a political arena which would serve the interests of only one country or group of countries. The conference must be aimed at strengthening international security, and, in his delegation's view, the highest priority should be given to nuclear disarmament. Furthermore, the conference should be able to give general guidelines on future disarmament negotiations and other related questions, establishing a programme for those negotiations and the appropriate international machinery to ensure their success. The success of the conference would depend on very careful political and technical preparation, the participation of all the nuclear Powers and the establishment of a clear relationship with the General Assembly, so that there would be no doubt as to its legal and political status.
On several occasions, his delegation had expressed disappointment at the lack of progress at the Conference of the Disarmament Commission, possibly owing to structural defects. Care must be taken to ensure that a world disarmament conference did not repeat the experience of the Conference of the Disarmament Commission. It would be helpful to reconvene the Disarmament Commission as a preparatory body for the conference. One advantage of doing so would be the fact that it was a plenary Commission on which every Member State was represented.

The Ad Hoc Committee would have to work hard to provide the General Assembly with the information it needed for discussions at the twenty-ninth session. In the First Committee at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, his delegation had referred at length to the need for adequate political preparation for the conference. Since the unfortunate experience of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 2930 (XXVII), much progress had been made. However, the problems which had paralysed discussions in 1973 still posed a threat, and the Committee should approach its work with idealistic pragmatism.

The proposals put forward in the Committee regarding the documentation to be prepared should be regarded as only procedural arrangements to prepare the way for substantive political efforts, including the participation of the nuclear Powers in the Committee's work and in the preparation of the Conference. The index already prepared by the Secretariat and circulated as Conference Room Paper No. 1 was not exactly what his delegation had envisaged; however, the index together with the summary, employing the headings suggested by the Chairman, would meet the Committee's needs. It was to be hoped that the documentation would be available before the Committee's June session. His delegation had no objection in principle to the establishment of a working group. However, the Committee would be in a much better position to take a decision on the establishment of such a group after its June session.

Mr. ZULUTA (Colombia) said that when the founding Members of the United Nations had drafted the Preamble to the Charter, they had consciously made the first aim of the Organization that of saving future generations from the scourge of war. Disarmament was the only way in which that objective could be achieved. The mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee was, in essence, to make it possible to convene a world disarmament conference. The task before the Committee was therefore not only to examine the documents submitted by the Secretariat but to make every effort to
(Mr. Zuleta, Colombia)

overcome the difficulties which prevented the nuclear Powers from co-operating in the Committee's work. The Committee should not pass judgement on the nuclear Powers but create the international atmosphere needed to convene the conference. He was certain that in June the Committee would have a clearer picture of its work, and he assured members that they could rely on his delegation to co-operate.

His Government strongly supported the majority view that the conference must be aimed at the limitation of nuclear weapons, with a view to their eventual elimination, and the limitation of conventional weapons, for both were absorbing resources which could be devoted to economic and social development. Rapid changes were taking place in the world, and his delegation viewed the Committee's task with optimism. What had seemed to be impossible yesterday was only difficult today, and difficulties could be overcome with understanding and perseverance.

Mr. HOLGER (Chile) said that his Government had always supported the idea of convening a world disarmament conference, an idea which had originated among the non-aligned countries. It was encouraging to note that three of the nuclear Powers were attending the Committee's meetings, and he welcomed the Chairman's suggestion that he should contact the two other nuclear Powers with a view to persuading them to participate. It was well known that the problem of disarmament was linked with international politics. To speak of disarmament was to speak of peace, security and development. The Committee's task was therefore very complex and must be approached with caution. In that connexion, his delegation agreed with the representative of Spain that the Committee should avoid the two extremes of convening the conference too hastily with unsuccessful results or postponing it indefinitely because the necessary pre-conditions had not been met.

In his delegation's view, the Committee's efforts should be supplemented by regional agreements on disarmament. In that connexion, he found the proposal of the Head of State of Peru for a subregional agreement on the freezing of arms purchases extremely positive. His Government fully supported that initiative and shared the hope that Peru and its neighbours could agree to freeze expenditure on defence and use the resources thus released to combat under-development. Although the Head of State of Peru had made his proposal in January 1974, it was in line with the spirit and letter of the agreements approved by the recent special session of the General Assembly, which Chile supported without reservation.

/...
The Committee's discussions had been constructive, and the Argentine proposal to establish a working group unquestionably constituted a great step forward. The proposals of the representatives of Mexico and Brazil were also extremely useful. The former had proposed documentation to be prepared by the Secretariat which would help the Committee in its work, and the latter had underlined the importance of adequate political preparation for the conference. He assured the Committee that his delegation would co-operate fully in the difficult and delicate tasks before it.

Mr. SIKAULU (Zambia) said that his country's views on the convening of a world disarmament conference had already been adequately expressed elsewhere. It would not be necessary to repeat them, since they remained unchanged. His delegation had been disappointed that the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 2930 (XXVII) had been unable to discharge its mandate or to hold any official meetings. The difficulties encountered in that regard had undoubtedly further postponed the holding of the conference. However, he felt that the Ad Hoc Committee could learn a lesson from the controversy which had arisen following the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2930 (XXVII). His delegation was glad that the Committee had been established with a clear mandate set out in General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII). The Committee's decisions concerning the summary document to be prepared by the Secretariat and the establishment of a working group were encouraging. If it continued its work in the same constructive spirit, it could be expected to make more tangible progress in June. His delegation agreed that the Committee had no mandate to prepare for the conference.

His delegation was somewhat hesitant to accept the inclusion of the views expressed during the unofficial discussions of the Special Committee in 1973 in the summary document to be prepared by the Secretariat. The specific mandate entrusted to the Committee only referred to the views and suggestions of Governments. However, his delegation supported the proposed structure of the summary document under subject headings.

Mr. GARCIA ROELES (Mexico) said that he wished to refer to the "provisional list of participants" which had just been circulated to members of the Ad Hoc Committee. The co-operation of the nuclear Powers in the Committee's work, as referred to in paragraph 3, could obviously vary from the most elementary...
(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

maintenance of contacts to participation on an equal footing. The provisional list of participants as drafted might give the impression that one nuclear Power had a privileged position in the Committee. He asked why the name of the USSR delegation and its representatives was not included on page 7 under the heading "Representatives of States referred to in paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII)."

Mr. BJÖRNERSTEDT (Secretary of the Committee) said that the document had been prepared in accordance with the wishes of the three States concerned and had been circulated in provisional form so that corrections could be made subsequently. It would be circulated as an official Committee document when it had been finalized.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation interpreted paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) to mean that his delegation was entitled to participate in the Committee's work with the same rights as the designated members. That meant that it had the right to appear among the members of the Committee in alphabetical order and to be seated as a member of the Committee. If the other nuclear Powers wished to do otherwise at the present stage, that was for them to decide.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that he was referring to a matter of principle. Every effort should be made to ensure that the other four nuclear Powers would co-operate to the maximum degree, as the USSR was doing. In order to achieve that objective, all possible obstacles must be removed. The list of members or of members of delegations of States appointed to any United Nations body should not create different categories. In his view, paragraph 3 could not be interpreted to mean that the nuclear Powers were designated members of the Committee. If necessary, a distinction could be made between the representatives of States referred to in paragraph 3 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII) to the effect that some were participating fully and others were merely present at the discussion. In any case, the USSR delegation should be included on page 7 of the list under the heading "Representatives of States referred to in paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII)" and not among the designated members of the Committee.
Mr. ZULETA (Colombia) said that he strongly supported the view expressed by the representative of Mexico and hoped that it would be taken into account by the Secretariat.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) said that the solution might be to adhere strictly to the terms of the resolution. Instead of having the heading "Provisional list of participants", the document might be entitled "Provisional list of the 40 non-nuclear-weapon Member States appointed as members of the Committee". There could then be a heading which read "States possessing nuclear weapons which are participating in the work of the Committee". If the delegations of France and the United Kingdom wished to be placed in a different category, they could be. He expressed appreciation for the co-operative spirit shown by the USSR delegation.

The CHAIRMAN said that since the document was entitled "Provisional list of participants", it could be maintained as a provisional document for the time being. In the meantime, the Bureau could consult members of the Committee and the nuclear Powers, and, if agreement was reached in the Committee, a new list could be published. If no agreement was reached, a decision on the matter could be deferred until the Committee's next session in June.

Mr. JOB (Yugoslavia) pointed out that, apart from the problem raised by the representative of Mexico, there were errors in the information contained in the document.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would make the necessary corrections.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.